REMARKS

These remarks are set forth in response to the non-final office action mailed March 25, 2004 (the "Office Action"). As this amendment has been timely filed within the three-month statutory period, neither an extension of time nor a fee is required. Presently, claims 1 through 27 are pending in the Patent Application. In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Figures 1 and 6 have been objected to for lacking a "Prior Art" designation. In response, the Applicants submit herewith corrected Figures 1 and 6 each designated as "Prior Art". In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claim 9 has been objected to for improper form as an improper multiple dependency. In response, the Applicants have amended the preamble of claim 9 to dependent upon only claim 1 as its base claim.

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 12, 13, 17, 18, 22, 23 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,076,108 to Courts et al. ("Courts") in view of U.S. Patent 6,041,357 to Kunzelman et al. ("Kunzelman"). Also, in paragraph 3, claims 3-5, 14-16, and 24-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Courts in view of Kunzelman and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,682 to Vanstone et al. ("Vanstone"). Moreover, in paragraph 4, claims 8, 9 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Courts in view of Kunzelman and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,264 to Colby et al. ("Colby"). Additionally, in paragraph 5, claims 10 and 20 yet further have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunzelman in view of Courts. Finally, in paragraph 6, claims 11 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunzelman in view of Courts and further in view of Colby.

In response, the Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 18, 20 and 22 to reflect the "server-side" aspect of the present invention as discussed in the helpful and most appreciated personal interview in Washington D.C. at the U.S.P.T.O. on June 17, 2004. In this regard, while Courts and Kunzelman contemplate the user of client-side cookie technology for storing session state information, neither Courts nor Kunzelman teach a system which would avoid the use of client-side storage of information. In the Applicants' invention, however, the use of a server-side storage area permits the maintenance of session information without requiring the placement of a cookie on the client side. In particular, in the case of a lightweight client, the use of a cookie may not be permissible. Hence, the use of the Applicants' technology can provide for a more diverse set of clients and for far greater scalability than is possible by any technologies incorporating the teachings of Courts and Kunzelman.

In conclusion, the Applicant believes that the amended claims distinguish over the cited art and stand patentable and ready for an indication of allowance. To that end, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon the Applicant's amendments to the claims, and owing to the foregoing remarks. This entire application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, such action is respectfully requested. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 22, 2004

Steven M. Greenberg
Reg. No.: 44,725
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
200 East Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 2040
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Customer No. 31292
Tel: (954) 828-1488
Fax: (954) 828-9122